

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Criminal Appeal (SJ) No.4690 of 2018

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-81 Year-2018 Thana- KASHICHAK District- Nawada

Ankit Kumar S/o Late Ranjeet Singh, R/o Vill.- Afsarh, P.S.- Warisaliganj in
the District of Nawada.

... .. Appellant/s

Versus

The State Of Bihar

... .. Respondent/s

Appearance :

For the Appellant/s : Mr.Sunil Kumar

For the Respondent/s : Mr.Smt Usha Kumari No-1

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE S. KUMAR
ORAL ORDER

3 18-01-2019 Heard learned counsel for the parties.

This is an appeal under Section 14(A)(2) of the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes (Prevention of Atrocities) Act, 1989 against the refusal of prayer for bail by order dated 20.11.2018 passed by learned 1st Additional Sessions Judge, Nawada in Spl(H) Case No. 99 of 2018 (arising out of Kashichak (Shahpur O.P.) P.S. Case No. 81 of 2018 registered under Sections 302/120(B) of the Indian Penal Code and Section 27 of Arms Act and Section 3(2)(V) of the SC/ST Prevention of Atrocities Act.

Informant has alleged in his FIR that his nephew had gone to see the decoration work and while returning he was killed by unknown miscreants. FIR is against unknown. The name of appellant has surfaced in this case during investigation on the basis of information given by Spy and he has been



remanded in this case on 31.10.2018 and in supervision it has been alleged that Rs. 1 lac was given to appellant by one Ranjeet Paswan to kill the deceased.

Considering the aforesaid facts and circumstances of the case, let the appellant named above be released on bail upon furnishing bail bond of Rs. 10,000/- (Ten thousand) with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of learned court below where the case is pending in connection with aforesaid case, with following conditions:-

(1) Bailors should be local having sufficient immovable property within the jurisdiction of the court concerned.

(2) appellant shall co-operate in the trial and shall be properly represented on each and every date fixed by the court and his absence on two consecutive dates without proper and sufficient reason the trial court will be at liberty to cancel his bail bond.

(3) If the appellant tampers with the evidence or the witnesses of the case, in that case, prosecution will be at liberty to move for cancellation of bail of the appellant.

Accordingly, the impugned order is set aside and this appeal stands allowed.

(S. Kumar, J)

veena/-

U		T	
---	--	---	--

